



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,881	06/26/2003	Shivaram Bhat	03226.497001;P9016	7839
32615	7590	02/15/2007		
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			EXAMINER MYINT, DENNIS Y	
			ART UNIT 2162	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/608,881	BHAT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis Myint	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-14,16 and 18-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-14,16 and 18-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/01/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Applicant's Amendment, filed on 01 December 2006.
2. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-14, 16, and 18-29 are pending in this application. Claim 1, 9, 16, and 24 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed on 01 December 2006, claims 2, 10, 15, and 17 were cancelled and claims 1, 9, 16, and 24 were amended.
This office action is made final.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 28 and 29 objected to because of the following informalities: said claims depends on claim 2, which was cancelled. Correction of "The method of claim 2" to "The method of claim 1" is suggested. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 01 December 2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claim 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 16, 18, 19, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor et al., (hereinafter "Saylor")(U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0186238) in view of Brun et al., (hereinafter "Brun") (European Patent Application EP1009130A1), and further in view of Barzilai et al., (hereinafter "Barzilai") (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0104015).

Referring to claim 1, Saylor is directed to a system and method for managing resources and teaches the limitations:

Art Unit: 2162

“accessing a list of resources, wherein a resource comprises an object defined by a service type” (Paragraph 0049, i.e., *visual hierarchy derives from a logical hierarchy containing resources in dependency relationship with one another*; Paragraph 00663, i.e., *Conceptually, resource 24 is a placeholder for a wide range of things: usually, it performs a function*; and Paragraph 0051, i.e., *Resources include hardware, applications, services, business processes, organizational structures....*) and “wherein a resource is identifiable by a resource name” (Sylor, Paragraph 0064, i.e., *Properties of resource 24 include a name*);

“relationship determines that the second resource is a sub-resource of the first resource” (Paragraph 0088, i.e., *logical hierarchy 30 can organize information into tiers, with parent-child relationships are based on dependency relationships 78*. Therefore, resources at lower levels (children) in the tree are sub-resources of the resources at higher levels (parents) (Paragraph 0088, i.e., *parent resource profiles 77 can provide to multiple child resource profiles 77, as with a server that provides multiple networked services, while each of the networked services (for instance, DNS, file sharing, and network security) provides its features to multiple software applications*). This disclosure of Sylor clearly teaches a hierarchy wherein resources and sub-resources are organized.); and

“representing said first and second resources in a hierarchical organization reflecting said relationship, wherein said hierarchical organization comprises a top-level resource name and a plurality of sub-resource names corresponding to said top level resource name, wherein said plurality of sub-resource names comprises said top level

Art Unit: 2162

resource name and an additional name portion separated from said top-level name” (Paragraph 0049-0050, i.e., *logical hierarchy*; Paragraph 0088, i.e., *logical hierarchy 30 can organize information into tiers, with parent-child relationships are based on dependency relationships 78*; Paragraph 0088, i.e., *parent resource profiles 77 can provide to multiple child resource profiles 77, as with a server that provides multiple networked services, while each of the networked services (for instance, DNS, file sharing, and network security) provides its features to multiple software applications*; and Paragraph 0089, i.e., *the path-uniqueness of directed tree 39*). Note that in the said hierarchical tree of resources (logical hierarchy of Sylor), parent nodes bear top-level names and child nodes bear sub-resource names to conform to path-uniqueness of a directed tree and that it is well known in the art that a path-unique name of a tree comprises name of parents up to the root and name of child (i.e., top-level resource name and additional resource name) delimited by a slash.

Sylor does not explicitly teach the limitations: “comparing a first resource name for a first resource to a second resource name for a second resource to identify relationship between said first and second resources wherein said relationship is based on said first resource name and said second resource name”; “by a delimiter”, “intercepting a requesting identifying a resource name”; “locating said resource in said hierarchical organization, wherein said resource is subject to a policy definition governing access to said resource, wherein the policy definition comprises: a rule that references said resource and comprises at least one action associated with the resource, a condition that comprises a constraint on the at least one action, a subject

that defines a collection of users to whom the policy definition applies; and a referral that comprises an identification of a second policy decision point to which the evaluation of the policy definition is being delegated”.

On the other hand, Brun teaches the limitations:

““comparing a first resource name for a first resource to a second resource name for a second resource to identify relationship between said first and second resources wherein said relationship is based on said first resource name and said second resource name” (Page 1 Line-32-42, i.e., *comparing resource name prefix with the prefixes stored in an access border node directory*; Column 15 Line35-57, Column 16 Line-30-50 and Column 19 Line-32 through Column 20 Line-45. Particular note that the method and system of Brun is comparing “prefix” of a resource name to a with prefixes stored in an access directory name database (Brun , Column 1 Line-32-42). Also, Figure 9 of the specification of Brun discloses matching (comparing) prefixes of a resource name to other prefixes in order to identify relationship between resource names based on first resource name and second resource name.); and

“ by a delimiter” (Column 15 Line35-57, i.e., *Resource Identifier Type: this describes the addressing scheme used for this user (E.164, X.121, NSAP,)* . NSAP stands for *Network Service Access Point* and is one of two types hierarchical address and is defined in ISO/IEC 8348. Said NSAP and other addressing schemes such as E.164, X.121 all employ hierarchical name systems, wherein a top-level name and a plurality of sub-resource names corresponding said top level name are used. Said

Art Unit: 2162

plurality of sub-resource names comprises said top-level name and an additional name portion separated from said top-level resource name by a delimiter (a dot).

Barzilai teaches the limitations:

“intercepting a requesting identifying a resource name” (Barzilai, Paragraph 0012, i.e., *For each time of user information requested by the application, the EPM checks for compliance of the application with the privacy policies subject to which the users submitted the information. Access is granted, preferably on a per-user, per-item basis, only after compliance has been verified*”);

“locating said resource in said hierarchical organization” (Barzilai, Paragraph 0013, i.e., *the information exchange nodes are arranged in a hierarchical structure*), “wherein said resource is subject to a policy definition governing access to said resource” (Barzilai, Paragraph 0012, i.e., *For each time of user information requested by the application, the EPM checks for compliance of the application with the privacy policies subject to which the users submitted the information*; and Paragraphs 0070-0073, i.e., “*A user request handler 46*”, “*An administrator request handler 48*”, and “*An application request handler 50*”), “wherein the policy definition comprises:

a rule that references said resource and comprises at least one action associated with the resource (Paragraph, 0013, i.e., *A basis privacy policy is defined for a root node in the structure, typically the enterprise home page*),

a condition that comprises a constraint on the at least one action (Paragraph 0070, i.e., *A user request handler 46 manages privacy-related*

interactions with site users, such as supplying policy information retrieved by policy engine 42; and also note Paragraphs 0071-0072),

a subject that defines a collection of users to whom the policy definition applies (Paragraph 0014, i.e., *policy to different **types** of users*); and

a referral that comprises an identification of a second policy decision point to which the evaluation of the policy definition is being delegated (Paragraph 0013, i.e., *Additional privacy rules are defined for other nodes in the hierarchy. The privacy for any given node is determined by combining the privacy policy of its parents with the additional privacy rules defined for the node itself. Thus, the level of privacy provided for user information typically increases as the user progresses deeper into the hierarchy and is asked to submit additional personal information or to authorized additional uses of information already submitted*).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method taught by Saylor for managing resources with the method taught by Brun for managing distributed directory services and locating network resources and the method of Barzilai for applying hierarchical privacy rules to hierarchies of information resources so that the combined system and method would compare the name of a first resource and the name of a second resource to identify their relationship based on their names and represent them in a hierarchical organization reflecting the relationship, wherein said hierarchical organization would comprise a top-level name and a plurality of sub-resource names corresponding said

Art Unit: 2162

top level name, wherein said plurality of sub-resource names comprises said top-level name and an additional name portion separated from said top-level resource name by a delimiter. One would have been motivated in order to *define a simple and effective method and system for locating a resource in large networks* (Brun, Column 8 Line-20-24) and in order to *offer a structured solution to managing variations in privacy policy that may be implemented in different parts of an enterprise* (Barzilai, Paragraph, 0010).

Claim 9, 16, and 24 are rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

Referring to claim 3, Sylor teaches the limitation:

"listing said resources in order according to their respective relationships (Paragraph 0137-01150, i.e., *Fishbone Hierarchy*).

Claim 18 is rejected on the same basis claim 3.

Referring to claim 8, Sylor teaches the limitation:

"one of the first and second resources is identified as a sub-resource of the other" (Paragraph 0076-0090. Also refer to the response to the applicant's arguments above for this limitation.).

Claim 23 is rejected on the same basis as claim 8.

As per claim 4, both Sylor and Brun teaches the limitation:

“a resource name comprises a plurality of components, wherein one component is separated from another component by a said limiter” (Brun, Column 15 Line35-57, i.e., *Resource Identifier Type: this describes the addressing scheme used for this user (E.164, X.121, NSAP)*). NSAP and other addressing schemes such as E.164, X.121, as disclosed by Brun , all employ hierarchical name systems, wherein a top-level name and a plurality of sub-resource names corresponding said top level name are used and said plurality of sub-resource names comprises said top-level name and an additional name portion separated from said top-level resource name by a delimiter (*a dot*). In addition, Sylor also taught the said limitation (Paragraph 0089, i.e., *the path-uniqueness of directed tree* 39). Note that in the said hierarchical tree of resources (logical hierarchy of Sylor), parent nodes bear are top-level names and child nodes bear sub-resource names to conform to path-uniqueness of a directed tree and that it is well known in the art that a path-unique name of a tree comprises name of parents up to the root and name of child (i.e., top-level resource name and additional resource name) delimited by a slash.

Claims 11 and 19 are rejected on the same basis as claim 4.

8. Claim 5, 6, 12, 13, 20, 21, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor in view of Brun, further in view of Barzilai and further in

view of Carmel et al. (hereinafter "Carmel") (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0128615).

Referring to claim 5, the system and method of Saylor in view of Brun and further in view of Barzilai does not explicitly teach the limitation: "receiving information identifying what is used as said delimiter".

Carmel teaches the limitation:

"receiving information identifying what is used as said delimiter" (Paragraph 0041-0043 and 0047-0048, i.e., *predefined context delimiter*). Carmel et al. teaches a system and method for indexing and querying documents wherein context delimiters are used for both indexing and querying into documents (Paragraph 0041-0043 and 0047-0048).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system and method taught by Saylor in view of Brun and further in view of Barzilai as applied to claim 4 above with the system and method taught by Carmel et al. for indexing and querying into documents so that, in the combined system and method, comparing would comprise receiving information identifying what is used as the delimiter in resource names. One would have been motivated to do so simply to identify different components of the resource name.

Claim 12, 20 and 25 are rejected on the same basis as claim 5.

Referring to claim 6, Carmel teaches the limitation:

“receiving information for wildcard pattern matching of resource names”
(Paragraph 0049, i.e., *wildcard query*).

Claim 13, 21 and 26 are rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

9. Claim 7, 14, 22, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor in view of Brun, further in view of Barzilai and further in view of Shrader et al. (hereinafter “Shrader”) (U.S. Patent Number 6026440).

Referring to claim 7, the system and method of Sylor in view of Brun and further in view of Barzilai does not explicitly teach the limitation: “receiving information indicating whether a resource name is case-sensitive”.

Shrader teaches the limitation:

“receiving information indicating whether a resource name is case-sensitive”
(Column 9 Line-55 through Column 10 Line-22, i.e., *not case sensitive*). Shrader et al. teaches a system and method for web server account management wherein threshold keywords are indicated whether they are case-sensitive or not (Column 9 Line-55 through Column 10 Line-20+).

At the time the invention was made, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of identifying whether keywords/names are case-sensitive or not as taught by Shrader et al. to the system and method taught by Sylor in view of Brun and further in view of Barzilai as applied to claim 4 above so that, in the resultant system and method, comparing would comprise receiving information

Art Unit: 2162

indicating whether a resource name is case-sensitive or not. One would have been motivated to do so simply for better identification of resource names.

Claim 14, 22 and 27 are rejected on the same basis as claim 7.

10. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sylor in view of Brun, further in view of Barzilai and further in view of Ramamoorthy and further in view of Cheng et al., (hereinafter "Cheng") (U.S. Patent Number 5544322).

Referring to claim 28, Sylor in view of Brun and further in view of Barzilai does not explicitly teach the limitation: "forwarding the request identifying the resource from a first policy decision point to a second policy decision point for evaluation".

Cheng teaches the limitation:

"forwarding the request identifying the resource from a first policy decision point to a second policy decision point for evaluation" (Column 6 Line 65-67, i.e., *sent to policy server*). Cheng et al. teaches a method and system for policy-based authentication wherein a request for access could be referred to another policy server for evaluation (Column 6 Line 65-67).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of referring requests for access to another policy server as taught by Cheng et al. to the method of Sylor in view of Brun and further in view of Barzilai so that, in the resultant method, the request for resource would be forwarded to another policy server (a second decision point). One would have

Art Unit: 2162

been motivated to do so in order to provide a client “an authentication path that complies with both server’s policy and the client’s policy (if such a path exists)” (Cheng et al. Column 2, Line 45-48).

11. Referring to claim 29, Official Note is taken that the use of a cache for subsequent requests/processes is notoriously well known in the art.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2162

Contact Information

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is (571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dennis Myint

Examiner

AU-2162

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John E. Breene". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "J" and "B".

JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100